arXiv:1401.5384v2 [math.CA] 23 Jun 2015

On a linear interpolation problem for n-dimensional vector polynomials*

Mikhail Kudryavtsev

Department of Mathematics
Institute for Low Temperature Physics and Engineering
Lenin Av. 47, 61103
Kharkov, Ukraine
kudryavtsev@onet.com.ua

Sergio Palafox

Departamento de Física Matemática
Instituto de Investigaciones en Matemáticas Aplicadas y en Sistemas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
C.P. 04510, México D.F.
sergiopalafoxd@gmail.com

Luis O. Silva

Departamento de Física Matemática
Instituto de Investigaciones en Matemáticas Aplicadas y en Sistemas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
C.P. 04510, México D.F.
silva@iimas.unam.mx

Abstract

This work provides a complete characterization of the solutions of a linear interpolation problem for vector polynomials. The interpolation problem consists in finding n scalar polynomials such that an equation involving a linear combination of them is satisfied for each one of the N interpolation nodes. The results of this work generalize previous results on the so-called rational interpolation and have applications to direct and inverse spectral analysis of band matrices.

Mathematics Subject Classification(2010): 30E05; 41A05.
Keywords: Linear interpolation; Spaces of vector polynomials.
*Research partially supported by UNAM-DGAPA-PAPIIT IN105414

1. Introduction

In this work, we are concerned with the following interpolation problem. Given a collection of complex numbers $z_1, \ldots, z_N$, which are called interpolation nodes, and other collections of complex numbers $\alpha_k(1), \ldots, \alpha_k(N)$, $k = 1, \ldots, n$, such that $\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\alpha_k(j)| > 0$ for every $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, find polynomials P_k, $k = 1, \ldots, n$, which satisfy

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k(j) P_k(z_j) = 0 \qquad \forall j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \ . \tag{1}$$

We lay stress on the fact that the interpolation nodes $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_N$ are not required to be pairwise different (see Remark 2 in Section 4). The results of this paper give a complete characterization of all solutions of the interpolation problem (1).

The interpolation problem defined above has been studied in [7] and much earlier in [11] for the particular setting when $n = 2$. In this case, the theory developed in [7, 11] allows to treat the problem of finding a rational function $P_1(z)/P_2(z)$ which takes the value $-\alpha_2(j)/\alpha_1(j) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ at each interpolation node z_j. This is the so-called rational interpolation problem, or Cauchy-Jacobi problem, and $P_1(z)/P_2(z)$ is referred to as the multipoint Padé approximant [1, Sec. 7.1]. Noteworthily, although the research in this matter has put particular emphasis on the numerical aspect of the problem, [7, 11] consider the theoretical problem of accounting for the structure of all solutions of the rational interpolation problem. In [7], this is used to deal with the inverse spectral analysis of five-diagonal unitary matrices (the so called CMV matrices, cf. [6]) and this requires additional constraints for certain coefficients of the interpolating rational polynomials. Similarly, the spectral analysis of five-diagonal symmetric matrices also demands additional conditions (see [8]) on the rational interpolation problem. The description obtained in [7] permits to reduce the rational interpolation problem with such additional restrictions to a triangular linear system and to answer the specific question of the existence and uniqueness (or non-uniqueness) of the solution to the inverse spectral problem. Other approaches to rational interpolation can be found in [4, 5, 10].

The present work generalizes to any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the linear interpolation theory given in [7, Sec. 2]. The passage from $n = 2$ to any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is not straightforward; many of the obtained results require differing techniques. Particularly, this becomes clear in Sections 4 and 5. Similar generalizations of the rational interpolation problem that also focus on the structure of the set of solutions can be found in [2, 3, 12, 13].

Our main motivation for studying the interpolation problem given by (1) lies in its applications to direct and inverse spectral problems of $N \times N$ symmetric band

matrices with $2n+1$ diagonals, which will be considered in a forthcoming paper [9]. Notwithstanding the fact that the interpolation theory discussed in this work was developed with the applications to inverse spectral analysis in mind, we solve a problem interesting by itself and which may have other applications. It is worth remarking that, although [2, 3, 12, 13] also deal with the structural properties of the solution set of the interpolation problem given by (1), our approach differs in several respects from the ones used in those works. On the one hand, this permits to tackle the inverse spectral analysis of finite diagonal band matrices [9]. On the other hand, the method developed here allows a new characterization of the interpolation problem and new results on the structure of the solutions (see Secition 5 and, in particular, Theorems 5.2 and 5.3).

The exposition is organized as follows. In Section 2 we lay down the notation, introduce the main concepts, and prove some subsidiary assertions. Section 3 contains auxiliary results related to linear transformations of vector polynomials. Finally, in Sections 4 and 5, we show that the so-called *generators* determine the set of solutions of the interpolation problem given by (1) and provide a complete characterization of this set.

2. Vector polynomials and their height

Throughout this work we consider the number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to be fixed. We begin this section by fixing the notation and introducing some auxiliary concepts.

Definition 1. Let us denote by $\mathbb{P}$ the space of n-dimensional vector polynomials, viz.,

$$\mathbb{P} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{p}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} P_1(z) \\ P_2(z) \\ \vdots \\ P_n(z) \end{pmatrix} : \ P_k \text{ is a scalar polynomial for } k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathbb{P}$ is an infinite dimensional linear space and it is a module over the ring of scalar polynomials, i. e, for any scalar polynomial S,

$$\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P} \Rightarrow S\boldsymbol{p} = (SP_1(z), SP_2(z), \dots, SP_n(z))^t \in \mathbb{P}\,.$$

Definition 2. Let the function $h : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{0, -\infty\}$ be defined by

$$h(\boldsymbol{p}) := \begin{cases} \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,n\}} \{n \deg P_j(z) + j - 1\}\,, & \boldsymbol{p} \neq 0\,, \\ -\infty, & \boldsymbol{p} = 0\,, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where it has been assumed that $\deg 0 = -\infty$. The number $h(\boldsymbol{p})$ is called the height of the vector polynomial $\boldsymbol{p}$.

Note that for any scalar polynomial S

$$h(S\boldsymbol{p}) = h(\boldsymbol{p}) + n \deg S. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 2.1. *(a) If $h(\boldsymbol{p}) \neq h(\boldsymbol{q})$, then $h(a\boldsymbol{p} + b\boldsymbol{q}) = \max\{h(\boldsymbol{p}), h(\boldsymbol{q})\}$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$.*

(b) If $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = h(\boldsymbol{q}) = m$, then $h(a\boldsymbol{p} + b\boldsymbol{q}) \leq m$ for every $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$.

(c) If $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = h(\boldsymbol{q}) = m$, then there exists a $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{p} + c\boldsymbol{q}) \leq m - 1$

Proof. We only prove (c) since (a) and (b) are proven with the same argumentation. Let $m = nk + l$ with $l \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, then k and l are uniquely determined by m and $\deg(Q_{l+1}(z)) = \deg(P_{l+1}(z)) = k$. Therefore, there is c so that $\deg(P_{l+1} + cQ_{l+1}) \leq k - 1$. Also, one has that $\deg(P_j + cQ_j)$ is not greater than $k - 1$ for $l + 1 \leq j \leq n$ and $\deg(P_j + cQ_j)$ is not greater than k for $1 \leq j \leq l$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\boldsymbol{p} + c\boldsymbol{q}) = &\max_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}} \{n \deg(P_j(z) + cQ_1(z)) + j - 1\} \\ \leq &\max\{nk + l - 1, n(k-1) + l, n(k-1) + n - 1\} \\ \leq &nk + l - 1 = m - 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

For $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, let us consider the following set of elements in $\mathbb{P}$,

$$\boldsymbol{e}_{nk+1}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z^k \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \boldsymbol{e}_{nk+2}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ z^k \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ \ldots \ , \ \boldsymbol{e}_{n(k+1)}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ z^k \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

Clearly, $h(\boldsymbol{e}_j(z)) = j - 1$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.2. *The sequence $\{\boldsymbol{e}_j(z)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is a basis of the space $\mathbb{P}$, i. e., for any $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$ with $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = m \neq -\infty$, there exist unique numbers $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_m$, where $c_m \neq 0$, such that*

$$\boldsymbol{p}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{m} c_k \boldsymbol{e}_{k+1}.$$

Proof. We prove the assertion by induction. If $m = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, the result is immediate. As before, let $m = nk + l$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. Then one can write $P_{l+1}(z) = az^k + Q_{l+1}(z)$, where $a \neq 0$ and $\deg Q_{l+1} \leq k-1$.

Define $\boldsymbol{q}(z) := \boldsymbol{p}(z) - a\boldsymbol{e}_{nk+l+1} = (Q_1(z), Q_2(z), \ldots, Q_n(z))^t$, i.e. $Q_j = P_j$ for $j = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{l+1\}$. Thus, $\deg Q_j$ is not greater than $k-1$ for all $j = l+2, l+3, \ldots, n$ and $\deg Q_j$ is not greater than k for every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, l$. Therefore, one has

$$h(\boldsymbol{q}) \leq \max\{nk + l - 1, n(k-1) + n - 1\} = m - 1\,.$$

In the induction hypothesis we assume $\boldsymbol{q} = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k \boldsymbol{e}_{k+1}$. So, one obtains

$$\boldsymbol{p} = a\boldsymbol{e}_{nk+l+1} + \boldsymbol{q} = a\boldsymbol{e}_{m+1} + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k \boldsymbol{e}_{k+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \widetilde{c}_k \boldsymbol{e}_{k+1}.$$

The uniqueness of the expansion follows from the linear independence of the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{e}_j(z)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, which is straightforward to verify. □

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\{\boldsymbol{g}_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ be an arbitrary sequence of elements in $\mathbb{P}$ such that*

$$h(\boldsymbol{g}_m) = m - 1 \qquad \forall m \in \mathbb{N},$$

then $\{\boldsymbol{g}_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{P}$.

Proof. From Lemma 2.2, it follows that $\boldsymbol{g}_{m+1}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{m} c_{mk} \boldsymbol{e}_{k+1}(z)$, where c_{jj} is different from 0 for all $j = 0, \ldots, m$. So

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{g}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{g}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{g}_{m+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{00} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ c_{10} & c_{11} & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \\ c_{m0} & c_{m1} & \ldots & c_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{e}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{e}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{e}_{m+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\{c_{jk}\}_{j,k \in \{0,\ldots,m\}}$ is a triangular matrix, thus

$$\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{e}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{e}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{e}_{m+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{c}_{00} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ \widetilde{c}_{10} & \widetilde{c}_{11} & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \\ \widetilde{c}_{m0} & \widetilde{c}_{m1} & \ldots & \widetilde{c}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{g}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{g}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{g}_{m+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\{\boldsymbol{e}_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a basis, the same is true for $\{\boldsymbol{g}_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$. □

3. The height under linear transformations on $\mathbb{P}$

Let $A = \{a_{jk}\}_{j,k\in\{1,\dots,n\}}$ be an arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix. For any $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$, the linear transformation generated by A is

$$A\boldsymbol{p}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}P_1(z) + a_{12}P_2(z) + \cdots + a_{1n}P_n(z) \\ a_{21}P_1(z) + a_{22}P_2(z) + \cdots + a_{2n}P_n(z) \\ \vdots \\ a_{n1}P_1(z) + a_{n2}P_2(z) + \cdots + a_{nn}P_n(z) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{P}.$$

It follows from Definition 2 that

$$h(A\boldsymbol{p}) = \max_{j\in\{1,\dots,n\}} \left\{ n \deg \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{jk}P_k(z) \right) + j - 1 \right\}. \tag{5}$$

Lemma 3.1. *(a) For any arbitrary $n \times n$ matrix A and $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$,*

$$h(A\boldsymbol{p}) \le h(\boldsymbol{p}) + n - 1.$$

(b) If the $n \times n$ matrix A is upper triangular then for any $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$h(A\boldsymbol{p}) \le h(\boldsymbol{p}).$$

(c) If the $n \times n$ matrix A is lower triangular, then $h(\boldsymbol{p}) \le nk + n - 1$ implies $h(A\boldsymbol{p}) \le nk + n - 1$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Proof. (a) Note that, for all $j \in \{1, \dots n\}$ the inequalities below hold

$$n \deg \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{jk}P_k \right) + j - 1 \le n \max_{k\in\{1,\dots,n\}} \{\deg P_k\} + j - 1 \le h(\boldsymbol{p}) + j - 1.$$

Hence $h(A\boldsymbol{p}) \le h(\boldsymbol{p}) + n - 1$.

(b) Let the matrix $A = \{a_{jk}\}_{j,k\in\{1,\dots,n\}}$ be such that $a_{jk} = 0$ if $j > k$. Then, for the last entry of the vector polynomial $A\boldsymbol{p}$, one has

$$n \deg(a_{nn}P_n) + n - 1 \le h(\boldsymbol{p}),$$

and for the next to last

$$n \deg \left(\sum_{k=n-1}^{n} a_{n-1,k} P_k \right) + n - 2 \leq n \max_{k \in \{n-1,n\}} \{\deg P_k\} + n - 2 \leq h(\boldsymbol{p}).$$

Analogously, one obtains inequalities for all the entries up to the first one:

$$n \deg(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{1k} P_k) \leq n \max_{k \in \{1,\ldots,n\}} \{\deg P_k\} \leq h(\boldsymbol{p}).$$

Therefore, $h(A\boldsymbol{p}) \leq h(\boldsymbol{p})$.

(c) Let $A = \{a_{jk}\}_{j,k \in \{1,\ldots,n\}}$ be such that $a_{jk} = 0$ if $j < k$. And $h(\boldsymbol{p}) \leq nl+n-1$ with $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. One verifies that

$$n \deg P_j + j - 1 \leq nl + n - 1 \quad \forall j = 1, \ldots, n\,,$$

therefore $\deg P_j \leq l + \frac{n-j}{n}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. This implies that $\deg P_j \leq l$ for any $j = 1, \ldots, n$. So by (5), $h(A\boldsymbol{p}) \leq \max_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}} \{nl + j - 1\} = nl + n - 1$. □

Now, we introduce some matrices and state auxiliary results for them. These results will be useful in the next section.

Let $A_l = \{a_{jk}\}_{j,k \in \{1,\ldots n\}}$ be such that, for a fixed integer $l \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} a_{jj} &= 1 \qquad \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{l\}\ , \\ a_{jk} &= 0 \qquad \forall j \neq k, \text{ with } j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{l\}\ , \end{aligned}$$

that is, it has the form

$$A_l = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ a_{l1} & a_{l2} & \ldots & a_{l\,l-1} & a_{ll} & a_{l\,l+1} & \ldots & a_{ln} \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Also, for any $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, define the matrix function

$$T_l(z) := \operatorname{diag}\{t_k(z)\}\,, \quad t_k(z) := \begin{cases} z & \text{if } k = l\,, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise}\,, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

i. e., $T_l(z)$ is nearly the identity matrix, except that in the l-th entry of the main diagonal, $T_l(z)$ has the variable z instead of 1.

Lemma 3.2. *Fix $n \geq 3$ and $l \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$. If $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$ is such that $h(\boldsymbol{p}) \leq nk + l - 1$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, then $h(A_l \boldsymbol{p}) \leq nk + l - 1$.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$. If $h(\boldsymbol{p}) \leq nk + l - 1$, then

$$\deg P_l \geq \deg P_i\,, \quad 1 \leq i \leq l-1\,, \tag{8}$$

$$\deg P_l > \deg P_i\,, \quad l+1 \leq i \leq n\,. \tag{9}$$

On the other hand,

$$A_l \boldsymbol{p} = \left(P_1(z), P_2(z), \dots, P_{l-1}(z), \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{li} P_i(z), P_{l+1}(z), \dots, P_n(z) \right)^t .$$

By (8) and (9) we have

$$\deg \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{li} P_i(z) \right) \leq \max_{i \in \{1,\dots,n\}} \{\deg P_i(z)\} \leq \deg P_l(z)\,.$$

Hence, by (5),

$$h(A_l \boldsymbol{p}) \leq h(\boldsymbol{p}) \leq nk + l - 1.$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *If $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$ and $h(\boldsymbol{p})$ is not greater than $nk + j$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, then $h(T_{j+2}(z)\boldsymbol{p}) \leq nk + j + 1$, where $T_{n+1} := T_1$.*

Proof. The assertion follows from (8) and (9) by a reasoning similar to the one used in the proof of Lemma 3.2. □

4. Generators of the interpolation problem

In this section we begin the detailed analysis of the interpolation problem set forth in the Introduction. Let us first provide an alternative interpretation of the interpolation problem given by (1).

Clearly, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, one has

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k(j) P_k(z_j) \right|^2 = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \overline{\alpha_k(j) P_k(z_j)} \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \alpha_k(j) P_k(z_j) \right) = \langle \boldsymbol{p}(z_j), \sigma_j \boldsymbol{p}(z_j) \rangle \ ,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with the first argument being anti-linear, and

$$\sigma_j := \begin{pmatrix} |\alpha_1(j)|^2 & \overline{\alpha_1(j)}\alpha_2(j) & \overline{\alpha_1(j)}\alpha_3(j) & \dots & \overline{\alpha_1(j)}\alpha_n(j) \\ \overline{\alpha_2(j)}\alpha_1(j) & |\alpha_2(j)|^2 & \overline{\alpha_2(j)}\alpha_3(j) & \dots & \overline{\alpha_2(j)}\alpha_n(j) \\ \overline{\alpha_3(j)}\alpha_1(j) & \overline{\alpha_3(j)}\alpha_2(j) & |\alpha_3(j)|^2 & \dots & \overline{\alpha_3(j)}\alpha_n(j) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \overline{\alpha_n(j)}\alpha_1(j) & \overline{\alpha_n(j)}\alpha_2(j) & \overline{\alpha_n(j)}\alpha_3(j) & \dots & |\alpha_n(j)|^2 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{10}$$

Thus, the interpolation problem (1) is equivalent to finding $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$ such that

$$\langle \boldsymbol{p}(z_j), \sigma_j \boldsymbol{p}(z_j) \rangle = 0 \, , \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \tag{11}$$

Remark 1. It follows from (10) that σ_j is a nonnegative rank-one matrix. Moreover, for every nonnegative rank-one $n \times n$ matrix σ, there is a collection of complex numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} |\alpha_1|^2 & \overline{\alpha_1}\alpha_2 & \overline{\alpha_1}\alpha_3 & \dots & \overline{\alpha_1}\alpha_n \\ \overline{\alpha_2}\alpha_1 & |\alpha_2|^2 & \overline{\alpha_2}\alpha_3 & \dots & \overline{\alpha_2}\alpha_n \\ \overline{\alpha_3}\alpha_1 & \overline{\alpha_3}\alpha_2 & |\alpha_3|^2 & \dots & \overline{\alpha_3}\alpha_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \overline{\alpha_n}\alpha_1 & \overline{\alpha_n}\alpha_2 & \overline{\alpha_n}\alpha_3 & \dots & |\alpha_n|^2 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{12}$$

Thus, the interpolation problem can be stated as the problem of finding $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P}$ such that (11) holds for any collection of nonnegative rank-one $n \times n$ matrices $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N$.

Definition 3. Let us denote by $\mathbb{S}(n, N) = \mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^N)$ the set of all solutions of the interpolation problem (1), where σ_j is given by (10). We use the notation $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ when the concrete matrices $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N$ and the interpolation nodes $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^N$ are not relevant.

Note that an interpolation problem is completely determined by the sets $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N$ and $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^N$. Since a solution of (1) is an element of $\mathbb{P}$, one obviously has $\mathbb{S}(n, N) \subset \mathbb{P}$. Clearly, in the same way it happens for $\mathbb{P}$, the space $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ is a module over the ring of scalar polynomials.

Remark 2. Consider the interpolation problem given by $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N$ and $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^N$, if it turns out that $z_N = z_{N-1}$ and the vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(j_N) := (\alpha_1(j_N), \ldots, \alpha_n(j_N))^t$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(j_{N-1})$ are linearly dependent, then

$$\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^N) = \mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N-1}, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N-1})\,.$$

For the sake of convenience, we will suppose below that the vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ for the coinciding nodes are linearly independent, and in the case they are linearly dependent, the statements of the results should be changed in an evident manner to the corresponding statements with less nodes.

Let $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r})$ be the subset of $\mathbb{P}$ given by

$$\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}) := \{\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{P} :\ \boldsymbol{p} = S\boldsymbol{r},\ \boldsymbol{r} \in \mathbb{P},\ S \text{ is an arbitrary scalar polynomial}\}\,. \quad (13)$$

We say that $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r})$ is the set of vector polynomials generated by $\boldsymbol{r}$. Note that $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r})$ is a linear set and for any nonzero $\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r})$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that

$$h(\boldsymbol{q}) = h(\boldsymbol{r}) + nk\,. \quad (14)$$

Thus, all nonzero vector polynomials of $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r})$ are such that their heights are in the same equivalence class of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.

One of the main goals of this section is to show that $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ has exactly n generators, that is, there are n vector polynomials $\boldsymbol{r}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}_n$ such that

$$\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_n) = \mathbb{S}(n, N)\,.$$

This result is related to a known fact about the set of polynomials being solutions of the rational interpolation problem in its vector case [12, Thms. 3.1, 3.2] or the M-Padé approximation problem [13, Thm. 3.1].

Definition 4. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{P}$. We define the height of $\mathcal{M}$ by

$$h(\mathcal{M}) := \min\{h(\boldsymbol{q}) :\ \boldsymbol{q} \in \mathcal{M},\ \boldsymbol{q} \neq 0\}\ . \quad (15)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a linear subset of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ and $\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{p} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{r}) = h(\boldsymbol{p}) = h(\mathcal{M})$, then $\boldsymbol{r} = c\boldsymbol{p}$ with $c \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.1(c), it follows that there exists a complex constant c in $\mathbb{C}$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{r} + c\boldsymbol{p}) \leq h(\mathcal{M}) - 1$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is linear, $\boldsymbol{r} + c\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathcal{M}$, but there is no element $\boldsymbol{q} \not\equiv 0$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{q}) \leq h(\mathcal{M})$. Hence $\boldsymbol{r} + c\boldsymbol{p} \equiv 0$. □

Definition 5. We say that $\boldsymbol{r}$ in $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ is a first generator of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ when $h(\boldsymbol{r}) = h(\mathbb{S}(n, N))$.

Let us denote by $\mathbb{M}_1$ the set $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r})$ with $\boldsymbol{r}$ being a first generator. Clearly, Lemma 4.1 implies that $\mathbb{M}_1$ does not depend on the choice of the first generator.

Theorem 4.1. *If $\boldsymbol{r}$ is a first generator of $\mathbb{S}(n,N)$, then $h(\boldsymbol{r}) \leq N$ for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. The goal of this proof is to obtain a constructive algorithm for finding a solution whose height is not greater than N. Clearly, this implies the assertion of the theorem since, by definition, the height of the first generator is less than or equal to the height of any nonzero solution.

Our construction is carried out by induction. For $N = 1$, we have a solution

$$\boldsymbol{p}(z) := (C_1, C_2, 0, \ldots, 0)^t \,, \tag{16}$$

where $C_1 = \alpha_2(1)$, $C_2 = -\alpha_1(1)$, unless $\alpha_2(1)$ and $\alpha_1(1)$ are both zero, in which case C_1, C_2 are any nonzero constants. Indeed, (16) is solution of (11) since $\langle \boldsymbol{p}(z_1), \sigma_1 \boldsymbol{p}(z_1) \rangle = 0$, and $h(\boldsymbol{p}) \leq 1$.

Now, we suppose that the assertion holds for a fixed N and let us show that it also holds for $N+1$. We will reduce the interpolation problem with $N+1$ nodes to an interpolation problem with N nodes, which we know how to solve by the induction hypothesis.

Write $N = nk + l$ with $l < n$, where, for any fixed n, the integers k and l are uniquely determined. Suppose that $n \geq 3$ and let us first prove the assertion for a fixed l in $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-3\}$. If the matrix (10) satisfies that $\alpha_{l+2}(j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N+1\}$, then $\sigma_j = T_{l+2}(0)\sigma_j T_{l+2}(0)$. So, by putting the vector polynomial $\boldsymbol{p}(z) := \boldsymbol{e}_{l+2}(z)$ (see (4)), it turns out that $\boldsymbol{p}$ is an element of $\mathbb{S}(n, N+1)$. Indeed, since $T_{l+2}(0)\boldsymbol{p}(z) = 0$, one has

$$\langle \boldsymbol{p}(z_j), \sigma_j \boldsymbol{p}(z_j) \rangle = \langle \boldsymbol{p}(z_j), T_{l+2}(0)\sigma_j T_{l+2}(0) \boldsymbol{p}(z_j) \rangle = 0.$$

Moreover, $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = l + 1 \leq N + 1$. Thus, suppose without loss of generality that $\alpha_{l+2}(N+1)$ is not equal to zero (otherwise re-enumerate the points $z_1, \ldots, z_{N+1}$).

Consider the matrix A_{l+2} (see (6)), where

$$a_{l+2,k} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha_{l+2}(N+1)} & \text{if } k = l+2 \,, \\ -\frac{\alpha_k(N+1)}{\alpha_{l+2}(N+1)} & \text{for } k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{l+2\} \,. \end{cases}$$

With these settings, it is straightforward to verify that

$$A_{l+2}^* \sigma_{N+1} A_{l+2} = \operatorname{diag}\{d_k\}_{k=1}^n \,, \quad d_k := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = l+2 \,, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \,, \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Moreover, since σ_j is a nonnegative rank-one matrix for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, the

same is true for $A_{l+2}^*\sigma_j A_{l+2}$. Therefore (see Remark 1), for any $j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$, there are complex numbers $\beta_1(j),\dots,\beta_n(j)$ such that

$$A_{l+2}^*\sigma_j A_{l+2} = \begin{pmatrix} |\beta_1(j)|^2 & \overline{\beta_1(j)}\beta_2(j) & \overline{\beta_1(j)}\beta_3(j) & \dots & \overline{\beta_1(j)}\beta_n(j) \\ \overline{\beta_2(j)}\beta_1(j) & |\beta_2(j)|^2 & \overline{\beta_2(j)}\beta_3(j) & \dots & \overline{\beta_2(j)}\beta_n(j) \\ \overline{\beta_3(j)}\beta_1(j) & \overline{\beta_3(j)}\beta_2(j) & |\beta_3(j)|^2 & \dots & \overline{\beta_3(j)}\beta_n(j) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \overline{\beta_n(j)}\beta_1(j) & \overline{\beta_n(j)}\beta_1(j) & \overline{\beta_n(j)}\beta_3(j) & \dots & |\beta_n(j)|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Now, for all $j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$, let

$$\gamma_i(j) := \begin{cases} (z_{N+1}-z_j)\beta_{l+2}(j) & \text{if } i = l+2\,, \\ \beta_i(j) & \text{for } i \in \{1,2,\dots,n\}\setminus\{l+2\}\,, \end{cases}$$

and consider the auxiliary interpolation problem given by $\{\widetilde{\sigma}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ and $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^N$, where

$$\widetilde{\sigma_j} := \begin{pmatrix} |\gamma_1(j)|^2 & \overline{\gamma_1(j)}\gamma_2(j) & \overline{\gamma_1(j)}\gamma_3(j) & \dots & \overline{\gamma_1(j)}\gamma_n(j) \\ \overline{\gamma_2(j)}\gamma_1(j) & |\gamma_2(j)|^2 & \overline{\gamma_2(j)}\gamma_3(j) & \dots & \overline{\gamma_2(j)}\gamma_n(j) \\ \overline{\gamma_3(j)}\gamma_1(j) & \overline{\gamma_3(j)}\gamma_2(j) & |\gamma_3(j)|^2 & \dots & \overline{\gamma_3(j)}\gamma_n(j) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \overline{\gamma_n(j)}\gamma_1(j) & \overline{\gamma_n(j)}\gamma_2(j) & \overline{\gamma_n(j)}\gamma_3(j) & \dots & |\gamma_n(j)|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, there is a vector polynomial $\boldsymbol{q}$ in $\mathbb{S}(\{\widetilde{\sigma}_j\}_{j=1}^N, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^N)$ such that

$$h(\boldsymbol{q}) \le N = nk + l\,. \quad (19)$$

Define the vector polynomial

$$\boldsymbol{r}(z) := A_{l+2}T_{l+2}(z_{N+1}-z)\boldsymbol{q}(z). \quad (20)$$

Then, for all $j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \boldsymbol{r}(z_j), \sigma_j \boldsymbol{r}(z_j)\rangle &= \left\langle \boldsymbol{q}(z_j), T_{l+2}\left(\overline{z_{N+1}-z_j}\right) A_{l+2}^*\sigma_j A_{l+2}T_{l+2}(z_{N+1}-z_j)\boldsymbol{q}(z_j)\right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \boldsymbol{q}(z_j), \widetilde{\sigma_j}\boldsymbol{q}_{z_j}\right\rangle = 0\,. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Also, it follows from (17) that

$$T_{l+2}^*(0)A_{l+2}^*\sigma_{N+1}A_{l+2}T_{l+2}(0) = 0\,.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \boldsymbol{r}(z_{N+1}), \sigma_{N+1}\boldsymbol{r}(z_{N+1})\rangle &= \big\langle \boldsymbol{q}(z_{N+1}), T_{l+2}(0)A_{l+2}^{*}\sigma_{N+1}A_{l+2}T_{l+2}(0)\boldsymbol{q}(z_{N+1})\big\rangle \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

This last equality and (21) imply that $\boldsymbol{r}$ is in $\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N+1}, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N+1})$. Moreover, it follows from (19) and (20), by means of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, that

$$h(\boldsymbol{r}) \leq nk + l + 1 = N + 1.$$

Thus, the assertion of the theorem has been proven for $n \geq 3$ and $l \in \{0, \ldots, n-3\}$.

For proving the assertion when $l = n - 2$, consider

$$\boldsymbol{r}(z) := A_n T_n(z_{N+1} - z)\boldsymbol{q}(z)$$

and, repeating the reasoning above, it is shown that $\boldsymbol{r}$ is in $\mathbb{S}(n, N+1)$. Moreover, since $h(\boldsymbol{q}) < nk + n - 2$, Lemma 3.3 implies that

$$h(T_n(z_{N+1} - z)\boldsymbol{q}) \leq nk + n - 1\,.$$

Therefore, Lemma 3.1(c) yields $h(\boldsymbol{r}) \leq N + 1$.

The case $l = n - 1$ is treated analogously with

$$\boldsymbol{r}(z) := A_1 T_1(z_{N+1} - z)\boldsymbol{q}(z)$$

being an element of $\mathbb{S}(n, N + 1)$. Again, by Lemma 3.3,

$$h(T_1(z_{N+1} - z)\boldsymbol{q}) \leq nk + n - 1\,.$$

Thus, it follows from Lemma 3.2(b) that $h(\boldsymbol{r}) \leq N + 1$.

It is now clear how to finish the proof when $n < 3$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Given an integer $m \geq Nn$, there exists a solution $\boldsymbol{p}$ of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = m$.*

Proof. Let $m = (N + k)n + l$ with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n - 1\}$. Let us construct a solution $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{S}(n, N)$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = (N + k)n + l$.

Define $\boldsymbol{p}$ as follows

$$\boldsymbol{p}(z) := (0, \ldots, 0, P_{l+1}(z), 0, \ldots, 0)^t$$

where $P_{l+1}(z) = z^k \prod_{j=1}^{N}(z - z_j)$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_N$ are the nodes of the interpolation problem (1). It is straightforward to verify that p is solution of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ and

$$h(\boldsymbol{p}) = n \deg P^{(l+1)}(z) + l = (N + k)n + l.$$

□

Note that Lemma 4.2 and (14) imply that there are n vector polynomials in $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ whose heights are different elements of the factor space $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. We will see later on that there are infinitely many solutions for every equivalence class of the heights.

Lemma 4.3. *Fix a natural number m such that $1 \leq m < n$. If $\boldsymbol{r}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}_m$ are arbitrary elements of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$, then $\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]$ is not empty and $h\left(\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]\right) \neq h(\boldsymbol{r_j}) + nk$ for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. (In other words, $h\left(\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]\right)$ and $h(\boldsymbol{r_j})$ are different elements of the factor space $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$).*

Proof. That $\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]$ is not empty follows from Lemma 4.2 and (14) since $m < n$. We prove the second assertion by *reductio ad absurdum*. Suppose that, for some $k_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $j_0 \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$,

$$h(\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]) = h(\boldsymbol{r}_{j_0}) + nk_0\,.$$

Hence, there is $\boldsymbol{q} \in \mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]$ for which $h(\boldsymbol{q}) = h(\boldsymbol{r}_{j_0}) + nk_0$. Let $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_{j_0})$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{p}) = h(\boldsymbol{r}_{j_0}) + nk_0$. Then, by Lemma 2.1(c), there is $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{q} + c\boldsymbol{p}) \leq h(\boldsymbol{q}) - 1$. Clearly, $\boldsymbol{q} + c\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{S}(n, N)$ but not in $\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)$. This contradicts the fact that $\boldsymbol{q}$ is an element of minimal height in $\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_m)]$. □

Definition 6. Taking into account Definition 5 and Lemma 4.3, for $1 < j \leq n$, one defines recursively the j-th generator of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$ as the vector polynomial $\boldsymbol{r}_j$ in $\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}_{j-1}]$ such that

$$h(\boldsymbol{r}_j) = h(\mathbb{S}(n, N) \setminus [\mathbb{M}_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}_{j-1}])$$

and $\mathbb{M}_j := \mathbb{M}(\boldsymbol{r}_j)$.

In this definition we have used direct sum ($\dot{+}$) since $\mathbb{M}_k \cap \mathbb{M}_l = \{0\}$ for $k \neq l$. This follows from the fact that the nonzero vector polynomials in $\mathbb{M}_k$ and $\mathbb{M}_l$ have different heights as a consequence of (14) and Lemma 4.3. Clearly, each iteration of this definition, up to $j = n$, makes sense as a consequence of Lemma 4.3. Note also that $\mathbb{M}_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}_j$ does not depend on the choice of the j-th generator. Indeed, if, along with $\boldsymbol{r}_j$, the vector polynomial $\boldsymbol{q}$ is a j-th generator and $\boldsymbol{q}$ is not in $\mathbb{M}_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}_j$, then, taking into account that $h(\mathbb{S} \setminus [\mathbb{M}_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}_{j-1}])$ is not greater than $h(\mathbb{S} \setminus [\mathbb{M}_1 \dot{+} \cdots \dot{+} \mathbb{M}_j])$, it is straightforward to verify that Lemma 4.3 yields a contradiction.

5. Characterization of the solutions

This section deals with the properties of the generators of the interpolation problem given in (1). By elucidating the generators' properties, we are able to give a complete description of all solution of the interpolation problem.

Remark 3. Due to Lemma 4.3, and Definitions 5 and 6, one immediately obtains that

$$\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = \{h(\boldsymbol{r}_1), \dots, h(\boldsymbol{r}_n)\}.$$

The following simple assertion is used to prove Theorem 5.1 which gives estimates for the sum of the heights of generators.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $n > 1$. For $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $\boldsymbol{r}_j$ be the j-th generator of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$. Then, there are infinitely many complex numbers z such that the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z), \dots, \boldsymbol{r}_n(z)$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. We shall prove the lemma by *reductio ad absurdum*. By continuity, if the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z), \dots, \boldsymbol{r}_n(z)$ are linearly dependent everywhere but a finite set of points, then they are linearly dependent everywhere. Suppose, $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ is the number for which the vector $\boldsymbol{r}_k(z)$ is a linear combination of $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z), \dots, \boldsymbol{r}_{k-1}(z)$ for every z, but $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z_0), \dots, \boldsymbol{r}_{k-1}(z_0)$ are still linearly independent for a certain z_0. The latter means that

$$\operatorname{rank}\left(\boldsymbol{r}_1(z_0) \ \dots \ \boldsymbol{r}_{k-1}(z_0)\right) = k - 1\,.$$

By continuity, this rank also equals $k-1$ in some neighborhood of z_0. Also, by the hypothesis, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\boldsymbol{r}_k(z) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} F_l(z)\boldsymbol{r}_l(z)\,.$$

Solving this linear system for the unknown $F_l(z)$, the rank of the matrix being equal to $k-1$, we see that for any $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, F_l is a rational function of z. Therefore there are scalar polynomials $S_0, \dots, S_{k-1}$ such that

$$S_0(z)\boldsymbol{r}_k(z) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} S_l(z)\boldsymbol{r}_l(z)\,.$$

By Definition 6, taking into account (14) and Lemma 4.3, one concludes that all $S_l\boldsymbol{r}_l$ ($l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$) have different heights. Hence, by Lemma 2.1(a) there is $l_0 \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ such that

$$h(S_0\boldsymbol{r}_k) = h(S_{l_0}\boldsymbol{r}_{l_0})\,, \tag{22}$$

but according to (14) and Lemma 4.3 the r. h. s and the l. h. s of (22) are different elements of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. This contradiction finishes the proof. □

Theorem 5.1. *Let $n > 1$. For $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $\boldsymbol{r}_l$ be the l-th generator of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$. Then, for any $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,*

$$\sum_{l=1}^{m} h(\boldsymbol{r}_l) \leq Nm + \frac{m(m-1)}{2}\,.$$

In particular, when $m = n$, this gives an estimate of the sum of all generators.

Proof. The proof is carried out inductively with respect to m. For $m = 1$, the assertion has already been proven in Theorem 4.1.

Step 1. ($m = 1 \rightsquigarrow m = 2$)

Let N_1 be an integer such that

$$0 \leq N_1 \leq N \quad \text{and} \quad h(\boldsymbol{r}_1) = N - N_1\,. \tag{23}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{r}_1$ is a solution of minimal height of the interpolation problem given by $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N}$ and $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N}$, it turns out that $\boldsymbol{r}_1(\widetilde{z})$ does not vanish for any $\widetilde{z} \neq z_1, \dots, z_N$. Indeed, otherwise $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z)/(z - \widetilde{z})$ would be a solution of the interpolation problem whose height is less than $h(\boldsymbol{r}_1)$. Thus, choose the numbers $z_{N+1}, \dots, z_{N+N_1+1}$ each one of which is not equal to $z_1, \dots, z_N$, and consider the interpolation problem $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N+N_1+1}$ and $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N+N_1+1}$, where the new matrices σ_j are given by

$$\sigma_j := \begin{pmatrix} |R_1(z_j)|^2 & R_1(z_j)\overline{R_2(z_j)} & R_1(z_j)\overline{R_3(z_j)} & \dots & R_1(z_j)\overline{R_n(z_j)} \\ R_2(z_j)\overline{R_1(z_j)} & |R_2(z_j)|^2 & R_2(z_j)\overline{R_3(z_j)} & \dots & R_2(z_j)\overline{R_n(z_j)} \\ R_3(z_j)\overline{R_1(z_j)} & R_3(z_j)\overline{R_2(z_j)} & |R_3(z_j)|^2 & \dots & R_3(z_j)\overline{R_n(z_j)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_n(z_j)\overline{R_1(z_j)} & R_n(z_j)\overline{R_2(z_j)} & R_n(z_j)\overline{R_3(z_j)} & \dots & |R_n(z_j)|^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{24}$$

for $j = N+1, \dots, N+N_1+1$. Here the notation $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z) = (R_1(z), \dots, R_n(z))^t$ has been used. According to Theorem 4.1, there is $\boldsymbol{r}$ in $\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N+N_1+1}, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N+N_1+1})$ such that

$$h(\boldsymbol{r}) \leq N + N_1 + 1\,. \tag{25}$$

Let us show that $\boldsymbol{r} \notin \mathbb{M}_1$. To this end, suppose on the contrary that $\boldsymbol{r}(z) = S(z)\boldsymbol{r}_1(z)$ for some nonzero scalar polynomial S. Taking into account (24), it is straightforward to verify that, for $j = N+1 \dots, N+N_1+1$, one has

$$\langle S(z_j)\boldsymbol{r}_1(z_j), \sigma_j S(z_j)\boldsymbol{r}_1(z_j)\rangle = |S(z_j)|^2 \left(|R_1(z_j)|^2 + \dots + |R_n(z_j)|^2\right)^2\,.$$

Therefore, by the way the nodes $\{z_j\}_{j=N+1}^{N+N_1+1}$ have been chosen, the following should hold

$$S(z_{N+1}) = \cdots = S(z_{N+N_1+1}) = 0\,.$$

Thus, $\deg S \geq N_1 + 1$. This inequality together with (3) and (23) imply that $h(\boldsymbol{r}) \geq N - N_1 + n(N_1+1)$ which contradicts (25). Finally, observe that $\boldsymbol{r}$ is in $\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^N)$.

Step 2. $(m > 1 \rightsquigarrow m+1 \leq n)$

Since the assertion is assumed to be proven for $m > 1$, one can define recursively the numbers $N_1, \ldots, N_m$ such that for any $l \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, the following holds

$$h(\boldsymbol{r}_l) = N + (l-1) + N_{l-1} - N_l\,, \tag{26}$$

where it is assumed that $N_0 = 0$. We shall prove that there is a vector polynomial $\boldsymbol{r}$ in $\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^N, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^N)$ such that

$$h(\boldsymbol{r}) \leq N + m + N_m \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{r} \notin \mathbb{M}_1 \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathbb{M}_m\,.$$

From this, the assertion of the theorem clearly will follow.

Consider set $I := \{N+1, \ldots, N+m+N_m\}$ and the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &:= \{N+1, \ldots, N+L_1+1\}\,,\\
I_2 &:= \{N+L_1+2, \ldots, N+L_2+2\}\,,\\
&\vdots \qquad\qquad \vdots\\
I_m &:= \{N+L_{m-1}+m, \ldots, N+m+N_m\}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$L_k := \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left\lfloor \frac{m-j+1+N_m+N_j-N_{j-1}}{n} \right\rfloor\,.$$

Here $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ is the floor function and it is again assumed that $N_0 = 0$. Thus, $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is a partition of I, i. e.,

$$I = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} I_j \quad \text{and} \quad j \neq l \implies I_j \cap I_l = \emptyset\,.$$

Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z_0), \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}_m(z_0)$ are linearly independent. The existence of such number is provided by Lemma 5.1. Since the entries of each of those vectors are polynomials, the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z), \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}_m(z)$ are also linearly independent for any z in a neighborhood of z_0. Take the points $z_{N+1}, \ldots, z_{N+m+N_m}$

in this neighborhood such that

$$\{z_{N+1}, \ldots, z_{N+m+N_m}\} \cap \{z_1, \ldots, z_N\} = \emptyset\,,$$

and define the vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(j) = (\alpha_1(j), \ldots, \alpha_n(j))^t$ in such a way that, for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$,

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}(j), \boldsymbol{r}_l(z_j)\rangle \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}(j), \boldsymbol{r}_k(z_j)\rangle = 0 \tag{27}$$

for k in $\{1, \ldots, m\} \setminus \{l\}$ and $j \in I_l$. Note that the linear independence of the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_l(z_j)$ for any l in $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $j \in I$ guarantees the existence of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(j)$, $j \in I$, with the required properties.

For $j \in I$, define the matrices σ_j using (10) with the numbers $\alpha_k(j)$ given above and consider the interpolation problem given by $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N+m+N_m}$ and $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N+m+N_m}$. By Theorem 4.1, there is $\boldsymbol{r}$ in $\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^{N+m+N_m}, \{z_j\}_{j=1}^{N+m+N_m})$ such that $h(\boldsymbol{r})$ is not greater than $N + m + N_m$. It turns out that $\boldsymbol{r}$ is not in $\mathbb{M}_1 \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathbb{M}_m$, because if one assumes

$$\boldsymbol{r}(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} S_k(z)\boldsymbol{r}_k(z) \tag{28}$$

with $S_k(z)$ being a scalar polynomial ($k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$), a contradiction will follow. Indeed, one verifies from (27) and (28) that

$$\langle \boldsymbol{r}(z_j), \sigma_j \boldsymbol{r}(z_j)\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j \in I\,,$$

implies that

$$\text{either} \quad S_l \equiv 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \deg S_l \geq L_l - L_{l-1} + 1 \quad (L_0 = 0) \tag{29}$$

for $l \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and

$$\text{either} \quad S_m \equiv 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \deg S_m \geq N_m - L_{m-1} + 1\,.$$

On the other hand, taking into account (3), Lemma 2.1(a), and Lemma 4.3, one obtains after straightforward calculations that

$$\deg S_l \leq L_l - L_{l-1} \quad \text{for } l \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\,. \tag{30}$$

It follows from (29) and (30) that

$$S_1(z) \equiv \cdots \equiv S_{m-1}(z) \equiv 0\,.$$

Analogously, to prove that $S_m \equiv 0$, one shows that $\deg S_m \geq N_m - L_m + 1$ is

incompatible with (30) for $l = m$. This is done by verifying that

$$N_m - L_m + 1 > 0\,. \tag{31}$$

In view of (26) and Lemma 4.3, the numbers $m - j + 1 + N_m + N_j - N_{j-1}$, for $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, are different elements of the space $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. Therefore there exists a permutation $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ of $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, such that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{m - j + 1 + N_m + N_j - N_{j-1}}{n} \right\rfloor = \frac{m - j + 1 + N_m + N_j - N_{j-1} - a_j}{n}\,.$$

There is at most one j in $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $a_j = 0$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m} (j-1)\,.$$

Thus, the l. h. s. of the inequality (31) can be rewritten as follows

$$N_m - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{m - j + 1 + N_m + N_j - N_{j-1} - a_j}{n} + 1\,.$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} (m - j + 1 - a_j) \leq m\,,$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} N_m - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{m - j + 1 + N_m + N_j - N_{j-1} - a_j}{n} + 1 \\ \geq N_m - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{m + N_m + N_j - N_{j-1}}{n} + 1 \\ \geq N_m - \frac{m + (m+1)N_m}{n} + 1 > 0\,. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, it has been used that $m + 1 \leq n$. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{r}_j$ be the j-th generator of $\mathbb{S}(n, N)$. It holds true that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} h(\boldsymbol{r}_j) = Nn + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}\,.$$

Proof. Because of Theorem 5.1, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} h(\boldsymbol{r}_j) \geq Nn + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}\,. \tag{32}$$

Suppose that this is not true and define

$$Q(z) := \det\left(\boldsymbol{r}_1(z)\dots\boldsymbol{r}_n(z)\right)\,,$$

where $(\boldsymbol{r}_1(z)\dots\boldsymbol{r}_n(z))$ is the square matrix with columns given by the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_1(z),\dots,\boldsymbol{r}_n(z)$. For the entries of the generators, we use the notation

$$\boldsymbol{r}_j(z) = \left(R_1^{(j)},\dots,R_n^{(j)}\right)^t \quad \forall j\in\{1,\dots,n\}\,.$$

It follows from Definition 2, that for any j in $\{1,\dots,n\}$, there is $l(j)\in\{1,\dots,n\}$ such that

$$h(\boldsymbol{r}_j) = n\deg R_{l(j)}^{(j)} + l(j) - 1\,.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 4.3, when j runs through the set $\{1,\dots,n\}$, $l(j)$ also runs through $\{1,\dots,n\}$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} h(\boldsymbol{r}_j) = n\sum_{j=1}^{n}\deg R_{l(j)}^{(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n}(j-1)\,.$$

Thus the negation of (32) imply that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}\deg R_{l(j)}^{(j)} < N\,. \tag{33}$$

On the other hand, since the interchanging of two columns of a matrix leads to multiplying the corresponding determinant by -1, it is clear that for calculating the degree of the polynomial Q, one could use any arrangement of the vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_j$, $j\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Thus,

$$\deg Q(z) = \deg\det\left(\boldsymbol{r}_{l^{-1}(1)}(z)\dots\boldsymbol{r}_{l^{-1}(n)}(z)\right)\,.$$

Note that in this arrangement of the columns the diagonal elements of the matrix are the polynomials that determine the height of the generators. Hence, it is straightforward to verify that $\deg Q$ is the sum of the degree of the diagonal

elements of $\big(\boldsymbol{r}_{l^{-1}(1)}(z)\dots\boldsymbol{r}_{l^{-1}(n)}(z)\big)$, that is,

$$\deg Q(z)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\deg R^{(j)}_{l(j)}\,, \tag{34}$$

and, by (33), this is $<N$.

Now, fix a node of interpolation z_{l_0} and observe that, since $\boldsymbol{r}_j$ is in $\mathbb{S}(n,N)$ for all $j\in\{1,\dots,n\}$, one has

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\alpha_k(l_0)R^{(j)}_k(z_{l_0})=0,\qquad j\in\{1,\dots,n\}\,.$$

By construction, this system has a solution, that is, the determinant of the system vanishes, so $Q(z_{l_0})=0$. Since the interpolation node z_{l_0} was arbitrary, one concludes that

$$Q(z_1)=\cdots=Q(z_N)=0\,.$$

These equalities, together with (33) and (34), imply that $Q(z)\equiv 0$ which contradicts Lemma 5.1. □

Theorem 5.3. *Let $n\geq 2$. Any element $\boldsymbol{p}$ of $\mathbb{S}(n,N)$, can be written in the form*

$$\boldsymbol{p}=\sum_{j=1}^{n}S_j\boldsymbol{r}_j\,,$$

where S_j is a scalar polynomial and $\boldsymbol{r}_j$ is the j-th generator of the interpolation problem ($j\in\{1,\dots,n\}$).

Proof. For $j\in\{2,\dots,n\}$, consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{B}_j:=\{m\in\mathbb{N}:\ m=h(\boldsymbol{r}_k)+nl+1,\ \text{where } k<j \text{ and } l\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}\}\,,\\
&\mathcal{A}_1:=\{1,2,\dots,h(\boldsymbol{r}_1)\}\,,\\
&\mathcal{A}_j:=\{h(\boldsymbol{r}_{j-1})+1,\dots,h(\boldsymbol{r}_j)\}\setminus\mathcal{B}_j\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Now, define the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{g}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ as follows

$$\boldsymbol{g}_k(z):=\begin{cases}\boldsymbol{e}_k(z) & \text{for } k\in\cup_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{A}_j\,,\\ z^l\boldsymbol{r}_j(z) & \text{for } k=h(\boldsymbol{r}_j)+nl+1\,,\end{cases}$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}_k$ is given in (4). Note that $h(\boldsymbol{g}_k)=k-1$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1, we

have that $\{\boldsymbol{g}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a basis in $\mathbb{P}$. So, any $\boldsymbol{p}\in\mathbb{S}(n,N)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{p} &= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} c_j\boldsymbol{g}_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_j} c_k\boldsymbol{e}_k + \sum_{j=1}^{n} S_j\boldsymbol{r}_j\,, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where S_j is a scalar polynomial. Since $\boldsymbol{p}$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} S_j\boldsymbol{r}_j$ are in $\mathbb{S}(n,N)$, one has that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_j} c_k\boldsymbol{e}_k \tag{37}$$

is in $\mathbb{S}(n,N)$.

Let us show that (37) is a trivial solution. Suppose on the contrary that (37) is nontrivial, i. e., there is $k\in\cup_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{A}_j$ such that $c_k\neq 0$. Let

$$k_0 := \max_{1\le j\le n}\{k\in\mathcal{A}_j : c_k\neq 0\}$$

and $\mathcal{A}_{j_0}$ be such that $k_0\in\mathcal{A}_{j_0}$. By Lemma 2.1(a) the height of (37) is equal to k_0-1. Therefore, by (35),

$$h\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_j} c_k\boldsymbol{e}_k\right) < h(\boldsymbol{r}_{j_0})$$

and, by construction,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{A}_j} c_k\boldsymbol{e}_k \notin \mathbb{M}_1 \dotplus\cdots\dotplus \mathbb{M}_{j_0-1}$$

which contradicts Lemma 4.3. □

References

[1] G. A. Baker, Jr. and P. Graves-Morris. *Padé approximants*, volume 59 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1996.

[2] B. Beckermann. The structure of the singular solution table of the M-Padé approximation problem. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 32(1-2):3–15, 1990. Ex-

trapolation and rational approximation (Luminy, 1989).

[3] B. Beckermann and G. Labahn. A uniform approach for Hermite Padé and simultaneous Padé approximants and their matrix-type generalizations. *Numer. Algorithms*, 3(1-4):45–54, 1992. Extrapolation and rational approximation (Puerto de la Cruz, 1992).

[4] V. G. Cherednichenko. Rational interpolation, analytic solution. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 43(1):188–193, iv, 2002.

[5] V. G. Cherednichenko. Approximation by rational functions. *Appl. Anal.*, 87(10-11):1289–1293, 2008.

[6] L. Golinskii and M. Kudryavtsev. Inverse spectral problems for a class of five-diagonal unitary matrices. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk*, 423(1):11–13, 2008.

[7] L. Golinskii and M. Kudryavtsev. Rational interpolation and mixed inverse spectral problem for finite CMV matrices. *J. Approx. Theory*, 159(1):61–84, 2009.

[8] M. Kudryavtsev. The direct and the inverse problem of spectral analysis for five-diagonal symmetric matrices. II. *Mat. Fiz. Anal. Geom.*, 6(1-2):55–80, 1999.

[9] M. Kudryavtsev, S. Palafox, and L. O. Silva. Inverse spectral analysis for a class of finite band symmetric matrices. *Preprint*, arXiv:1409.3868, 2014.

[10] M. Pindor. Rational approximation and noise. In *Harmonic analysis and rational approximation*, volume 327 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.*, pages 145–156. Springer, Berlin, 2006.

[11] M. Van Barel and A. Bultheel. A new approach to the rational interpolation problem. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 32(1-2):281–289, 1990. Extrapolation and rational approximation (Luminy, 1989).

[12] M. Van Barel and A. Bultheel. A new approach to the rational interpolation problem: the vector case. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 33(3):331–346, 1990.

[13] M. Van Barel and A. Bultheel. A general module-theoretic framework for vector M-Padé and matrix rational interpolation. *Numer. Algorithms*, 3(1-4):451–461, 1992. Extrapolation and rational approximation (Puerto de la Cruz, 1992).